IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS PINE BLUFF DIVISION

JEREMY KENNEDY, ADC #093061 **PLAINTIFF**

v. No: 5:13-cv-376-DPM

RAY HOBBS; LARRY MAY; GREG HARMON; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES FEDERAL COURT SYSTEM

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Motion for reconsideration, № 6, denied. The Court entered judgment in this § 1983 case after finding that Kennedy had failed to pay the filing and administrative fees and was a "three-striker" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Kennedy now disputes that at least two dismissals, *Kennedy v. Byers*, 5:04-cv-8, and *Kennedy v. Minor*, 5:04-cv-46, are not strikes due to a change in the law, and moves for reconsideration.

Kennedy is correct that a dismissal for failure to exhaust is not a strike. Owens v. Isaac, 487 F.3d 561, 563 (8th Cir. 2007). But in both Byers and Minor, his cases were not dismissed for failure to exhaust, but for failure to state a claim, and appropriately so. Those cases were Heck-barred because Kennedy challenged "actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or

sentence invalid[.]" Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477, 486 (1994); Portley-El v.

Brill, 288 F.3d 1063, 1066 (8th Cir. 2002).

Since Edwards v. Balisok, 520 U.S. 641 (1997), the law has not changed; in

order to challenge the loss of good time credits, Kennedy had to file a writ of

habeas corpus, not an action under § 1983. Entzi v. Redmann, 485 F.3d 998,

1003 (8th Cir. 2007). The courts' dismissals in Byers and Minor pursuant to

Heck are strikes under § 1915(g). E.g., Rivera v. Allin, 144 F.3d 719, 730-31

(11th Cir. 1998); see also Armentrout v. Tyra, 1999 WL 86355 (8th Cir. 1999)(per

curiam) (unpublished opinion). If Kennedy wishes to pursue this case, he must

pay \$400.00 (the statutory filing and administrative fees) and move to reopen

the case by 7 February 2014.

So Ordered.

D.P. Marshall Jr.

United States District Judge

_ 23 Janvary 2014

-2-